DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 144 JC 800 573

AUTHOR Hammons, Jim
TITLE Staff Development Is Not Enough.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 17p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Staff, Program and Organizational Development (1st, Dallas, TX, Summer 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; College Administration; *Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; Job Performance; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; Performance Factors; *Staff Development; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Staff development activities that affect professional ability must be coupled with efforts toward organizational development if two additional determinants of performance, employee motivation and organizational climate, are to be significantly improved. Indeed, emphasis on staff development alone may have negative effects in that such an approach neglects the need to adapt the organization to the new skills acquired by personnel and is ineffective in dealing with problems such as non-existent goals or inadequate communications channels. To promote organization-wide changes, managers must diagnose current organizational problems, assign them a priority, and propose, implement, and evaluate alternative strategies for their solution. The implementation of such a process may be impeded by: failure to admit that problems exist; conflicts between currently employed management styles and the problem-solving, participative approach of organizational development; the resistance of managers to outside intervention; the lack of tools appropriate for the community college level; costs; and the lack of sufficiently trained persons. To encourage and expedite the acceptance of organizational development, staff development practitioners and university professors should call attention in the literature to the need for organizational development, offer training sessions, and make efforts to secure funds. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194144

STAFF DEVELOPMENT
IS NOT ENOUGH

Jim Hammons
Professor and Coordinator
Higher Education
University of Arkansas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James O. Hammons
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Paper presented at the First
Annual Meeting of the
National Council of Staff, Program & Organizational Development
Dallas, Texas
Summer 1978

JC 800 573

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IS NOT FNOUGH

by

Jim Hammons

Let me look at you.

For almost nine years I have been involved in staff development, and since 1972, I have been encouraging the development of a national organization. I am honored and delighted to be invited here to speak at your first national meeting and I hope that what I have to say will help in keeping the staff development movement alive, for I believe that staff development is an essential element in the future success of the community college. Before I begin, let me find out who is here.

First, how many of you are full-time staff development people?

Next, how many of you have responsibilities for staff development on a part-time basis?

Of those remaining, how many of you are members of a staff development committee?

Now, how many of you are administrators who are not actually involved in, but are interested in staff development?

Finally, how many of you are faculty members who are not actually involved in, but are interested in staff development?

It's encouraging and gratifying to see the number of people attending who have full and part-time responsibilities in staff development. However, for the most part, I am not going to be talking about staff development today. Rather, I will focus on what I believe is the key to the future of the community college--organizational development. That is not to say that staff development isn't important--it is. But it is only a piece of the much larger whole called organizational development.

In thinking about what I would say today, I played around with a variety

---

Featured presentation made at first annual meeting of National Council of Staff, Program & Organizational Development, Dallas, Tx., Summer, 1978.

of catchy titles beginning with "Down With Staff Development," followed by "Why Staff Development Will Fail," or "Staff Development Won't Work." However, I concluded that perhaps the best title for my comments today will be a simple statement that "Staff Development Is Not Enough."

The purpose of these titles was to draw attention to the need to look beyond staff development--to realize that development of the staff not only won't solve our problems or allow us to better meet the challenges of the future but that, unless accompanied by an equal effort at developing our organizations, it may actually have a negative effect. I'll explain this in more detail a bit later.

But first, let me give you some background information about myself and my involvement in staff development. I do this not to impress anyone, but simply to establish that unlike some professors, I'm speaking from a base of practical experience not abstract theory.

Since 1962 when I entered the two-year college world, I have:

(1) Held full-time positions in a two-year technical institute and two community colleges, all in different states.

(2) Assisted over 100 colleges in 35 states and Canada.

(3) Conducted training for over 1,500 faculty, 1,000 chairpersons, 100 deans, and a dozen or so presidents.

(4) Helped train staff development people/teams from 60 to 70 colleges.

For the most part my experiences have disillusioned me regarding the results of staff development. In all too many instances, staff development activities can be compared to the little boy in his new blue serge suit who wet his pants. It felt good but nothing showed.

One of the reasons why nothing shows is that, for the most part, we've done a poor job of evaluating the results of staff development programs. Later this afternoon Gordon Watts will share the results of some work he and

I have done on evaluation criteria for staff development. In large part he will show that most staff development evaluation does not get beyond what we have called level one evaluation. I prefer to call that level of evaulation knee jerk reaction, referring to the fact that it consists primarily of gathering reactions of the participants at the end of an activity. It has more to do with how they feel about the workshop leader than anything else. It is rare that we would find level two evaluation which deals with the extent of learning which occurred. Of course, to do an adequate job of measuring or determining the degree or amount of learning that occurred, it would be necessary to do some sort of pre- and post-testing. If level two is rare, level three is virtually nonexistent. It consists of an attempt to determine if there have been any changes in behavior which can be attributed to the staff development activity. Needless to say, a finding that learning has occurred does not necessarily mean that this will be followed by a change in behavior. Finally, the fourth level of evaulation has to do with the results obtained as a consequence of the staff development activity. It is entirely possible that: (1) there may have been a positive reaction to the workshop; (2) learning may have occurred; and (3) there may have been a change in behavior and still have little or no demonstrable change in results accomplished.

However, the major reason for the failure of staff development to have a significant impact on improvement is its focus on only one of the three major determinants of performance--ability. Let me illustrate this by using an example that some of you may have heard me refer to before. It's an example involving two bricklayers. The bricklayers are laying a wall of brick and in so doing, the customary procedure is to start at opposite ends of the wall and work toward the middle. If we can assume for a moment that both bricklayers are competent and that the bricks are being laid properly, then what we have is a difference in

performance. What are the factors that contribute to or influence this difference in performance? The factors are essentially three: Ability, Motivation, and Organizational Climate.

Let me take a few moments to define these for you. I should caution you that my definitions are not the kind of definitions that one finds in reading a textbook. I don't know about you but I tend to have trouble with that kind of definition. Consequently, what I have attempted to do is to define the terms in words that have meaning to me and in words that I can understand. I do so on the assumption that if I can understand them, most anyone can. The first factor influencing performance is that of ability. Ability can be defined in a variety of ways, including the current capacity to perform. Ability includes a number of things, such as intellectual factors--verbal, numerical, and spatial skills. It also includes manual factors as well as personality traits. Ability refers to what a person <u>can</u> do.

The second factor influencing performance is motivation. I like to think of motivation as that something that comes from within that causes you to <u>use</u> your capacity. Another definition is willingness to perform. There are numerous motivators and a number of theorists who have attempted to ascertain the influence of one or more motivations on a given individual. A final way of defining motivation is to think of it as what a person <u>will</u> do. If you will recall, earlier we defined capability as what a person <u>could</u> do.

The third factor influencing performance is that of the climate of the work situation. Climate is a very personal thing. We need to think of climate as individual perceptions of the job atmosphere not group perceptions. I have seen situations where all but one or two people were very happy. However, the fact that the majority of the members of the organization were happy has no meaning or relevance to the one or two people who were negative toward the organization. We know that climate has a direct effect on motivation. And we

know that the behavior of leaders in an organization significantly influences climate. We also know that there are a number of dimensions of climate including such things as reward structure, personal and professional growth opportunity, work and work load, and status. At present, one of my graduate students is working on a dissertation which will focus on developing a diagnostic instrument for measuring the climate in a community college. Her review of the literature is well under way. Thus far she has identified over thirty dimensions of climate including status, goals, rewards, communications, leadership, control, conformity, responsibility and standards. But back to our theory.

Despite the efforts of various scholars, we have not been able to develop a theory which explains the interactions of those three factors. While we know that performance is a function of ability, motivation and climate, we are still unable to determine the precise relationship between them. But what does this have to do with staff development? To answer that I think we need to look at a definition of staff development. There are a number of these around. In fact, there have even been a number of articles which compared and contrasted the various definitions.

A definition that I am sure all of you would agree with is that staff development means improvement--improvement of people and improvement of job performance. Hopefully, one of the consequences of staff development will be improvement of the college. Another way of looking at staff development is to conceive of staff development as consisting of two major elements: personal development and professional development. If we add to this a recognition that staff is a term that refers to everyone who works in a college including its managers, faculty, and non-instructional personnel, then we have a pretty good grasp of what we refer to when we say staff development.

Staff development impacts directly on only one of the three major determinants of performance: ability. It impacts indirectly on motivation and climate primarily through its influence on persons who have been trained in those areas. Organizational development on the other hand impacts indirectly on ability and directly on organizational climate and motivation.

Earlier I mentioned that in some instances staff development may have had a negative influence on an organization. This occurs when staff development is not accompanied by attention to developing an organization so that it can adapt to the newly earned skills of the staff. A number of examples which illustrate this come to mind. The first of these relates to faculty workshops where faculty members learned new skills and then found that their organization was unable to support them or unable to adapt to the changes which were necessary if they were to implement these skills in their teaching.

A second example of this would be a faculty member who learns how to develop individualized instructional materials and wants to organize his course so students can enter or exit at any point in time, only to find a road block in the form of a registrar who insists on a uniform beginning and ending date for classes because it "has always been that way."

Another example relates to the results of our chairperson workshop. These have been well received. You might say that our knee jerk reaction has been good. We also have some indication from exercises completed during the workshop that there has been a rather substantial amount of learning which has occurred during the workshop. Unfortunately, we are not finding much evidence of change in behavior leading to a change in results. Part of the reason why chairpersons are unable to incorporate the skills and knowledge learned in the workshop into their day-to-day job is the actions of the person to whom they report. For example, it does no good to teach a chairperson how to make decisions

in a collaborative, systematic way if their dean makes decisions unilaterally. Similarly, it does little, if any good to teach the chairpersons a rational approach to problem solving if their superior is not going to be willing to utilize that process.

Another example and then I'll move on. Perhaps the most underrated and under-utilized staff member on campus is the secretary. It's only natural that sooner or later someone would get around to conducting staff development training sessions for the secretaries. One of my associates had done a pretty good job of this. Secretaries have learned a number of new skills and have become a great deal more responsible. For example, they have learned how to open the mail and how to pass along suggestions regarding what they think should happen to most of the mail. They've learned how to approach their boss and ask questions so that in the future they would be able to deal with something and not have to refer to him, and so forth. So what happens? The secretary who does all these things and who often begins carrying things home at night in order to get a head start the next day soon finds that she is ostracized by the rest of the secretaries. And at the end of the year does she receive any additional recognition in the form of salary or promotion? You know the answer.

Sole emphasis on staff development neglects the need to adapt the organization so that it can respond to pressures exerted by staff with newly acquired skills. Staff development also is not sufficient for dealing with any of the common organizational problems that we find in our institutions today. By common organizational problems, I am referring to problems such as the following:

-ineffective managerial practices or styles which keep the organization from reaching its goals.
- policies/procedures which are incompatible with what the organization is doing or needs to be doing.
-inadequate or non-existent goals.
-inappropriate organizational structures for future or present functions.
-lack of trust or openness.
-inadequate communications system or lack of downward flow.
-lack of planning or lack of involvement in planning.

-authority/responsibility imbalance.
-low motivational levels and apathy among members toward the organization.
-inadequate problem solving capability.
-lack of team work or disruptive competitiveness.
-decisions which are too far removed from the action.
-organizational norms which are inconsistent with people in the organization.
-a policy-procedure orientation versus a goal orientation.

To deal with these kinds of problems, you need to develop or improve the organization, which is organizational development.

As I look back, I have been doing quite a bit of talking about organizational development and thus far have not defined it. Let me attempt to do so now with the caution that the definition that I will present to you is one that I have developed. There are a number of other well-accepted definitions but they're all slightly different--somewhat like the definitions of staff development. However, I would like to share with you my definition. It is somewhat lengthy but I believe it does combine the key words/concepts of the other.

Organizational development is:

-planned system-wide organizational change aimed at increasing individual and organizational effectiveness and health.

Which

-is managed from the top.
-has commitment and involvement at all levels.
-requires the intervention of an internal or external change agent who is skilled in the application of behavioral sciences.

As seen from this definition organizational development is planned change--not the kind of happenstance change which occurs in all organizations. Organizational development is change which is system-wide and change which focuses on the organization versus change aimed at the individual or some part of the organization. The purpose of organizational development is to increase individual or organizational effectiveness, not merely individual effectiveness.

Every organization contains both individual or personal goals, objectives, and needs and organizational goals, objectives, and needs. It is not necessary

to satisfy both at the 100% level. The trick is to try and ensure that both individual and organizational needs are met.

With that definition in mind, what happens when a college decides to enter into a contract with an organizational development expert? What are the steps to be taken? While there are a number of opinions, there appears to be a consensus regarding the following steps:

1. A need for change exists.
2. There is a recognition of the need for change.
3. A direction for change is determined.
4. A diagnosis of the current situation is made.
5. Needs and problems are ranked in priority order.
6. Various alternatives/solutions are identified.
7. Intervention strategies are planned and implemented.
8. Results of the intervention are evaluated.

Obviously, there must be some need for change before organizational development is required. Recognition of this need for change must be shared by top managers in the organization and by a majority of the group members of the organization for the organizational development effort to be successful. Once it has been determined that there is a need for change, a logical sequence is for the direction for the needed change to be determined.

The next step in the implementation of organizational development would be to make a diagnosis of the current situation. The skilled OD practitioner will have available a number of techniques for use. However, the most common of these will probably be interviews, questionnaires, and direct observation. Each of these has its advantages and disadvantages, and each situation has its peculiarities which combine to make it critically important for the OD person to be both very familiar with the situation and to be comfortable with the use of a variety of methods of diagnosis. Since the most popular method of diagnosis

is some form of questionnaire, I thought it might be useful if I were to provide you with a couple of references which I have found very useful. Both contain a large number of instruments which might be used as they are or with adaptations by an OD practitioner. The first of these is Instruments in Human Relations Today, and was published in 1973 by University Associates. The authors are Pfeiffer and Heslin. The second book is entitled Measuring Human Behavior and was published by Teachers College Press at Columbia University in 1973. The authors are Lakey, Miles and Earle.

Once the diagnosis is completed, it is necessary to rank the needs or problems which were identified. This is necessary since not every problem or need which was identified can be addressed and not all things are of equal importance.

Following this, some consdieration must be given to the variety of alternative strategies which might be used. These implementation strategies include such things as external process consultation, survey feedback, job enlargement, job enrichment, changes in the structure of the organization, incorporation of new technology and team building. Eventually a decision is made to select a particular strategy. This is followed by the development of a plan for the implementation of the strategy and then, once the strategy has been attempted, by an evaluation of the results.

This final step in implementing an organizational development program, the evaluation of the results, is critical. As is true in so many evaluations, the most effective evaluation will be one directed at determining the extent to which the problems initially identified have been resolved or the goals originally established have been met. Thus, one would look for indicators such as a reduction in turnover or absenteeism, better cost efficiency, or, if a climate questionnaire were initially used, you would look for better or more positive results after the intervention. If the indicators or results are what you hoped

for, fine. If not, you'll have to select another strategy and try again.

I would like to close with some thoughts on two different aspects of organizational development. The first of these pertains to the problems that OD faces and the second to some suggestions regarding the way to expedite OD.

First, the problems. After I identified the seven problems I wished to discuss, I tried to rank them. I soon gave up. They cannot be ranked in order of importance because I believe they are of equal importance. Consequently, I will discuss them in the order of their listing, beginning with the lack of knowledge about organizational development by both management and other staff in our institutions. Many of you have been involved in staff development long enough to remember the problems that we had ten years ago when we were still trying to communicate what staff development was. Staff development is a relatively simple concept, whereas, as I'm sure you will now readily agree, organizational development is much more complex--which makes it much more difficult for others to understand. Further, I believe that our existing managers know considerably less about the basic notions which underline organizational development than they did about staff development. The net result of this is that we face a significant challenge in trying to increase the knowledge level about organizational development. And, as with staff development, this will be a necessary prerequisite to any further efforts to implement OD.

The failure to admit that failures exist is the second problem. When I speak of failure to admit that there are problems, I'm not referring only to managers. This is also true of all other persons within the institution (including faculty) who are aware that things are not going right but are still unwilling to admit it. Managers are particularly sensitive to this because their admission of problems is often viewed by them as admission of failure on their part.

Conflicts between management style and the general problem solving, participative approach of organizational development is another significant problem. Too many of our existing managers are still near the wrong end of the Theory X-Theory Y continum to be very uncomfortable with the implementation of organizational development. This conflict will create problems at two points in time. First, if fully informed of its implications many of these managers would never agree to attempting organizational development in the first place, and second, if an organizational development effort were to somehow get started on the campus without their awareness, they would very likely terminate it as soon as they became aware of its possible consequences.

A fourth problem is somewhat related to the previous two items, namely the strong resistance of many managers to ouside intervention. This is especially true when such intervention holds the promise for highlighting or publicizing problems which might in part be due to their actions. Presidents in particular are quite agreeable to outside persons coming in and working with faculty members, chairpersons, or even their deans. However, I see a noticeable drop-off in the number of presidents who are willing to admit that an outside person can be of assistance to them.

Another obstacle to the successful implementation of an organizational development effort is the lack of tools or instruments which are acceptable and appropriate for use in a community college setting. As I pointed out earlier there are a number of these instruments available. However, the very language of many of these instruments would negate their being used on a community college. Also, there are sufficient differences between educational institutions and business and industrial organizations to warrant our giving careful consideration to the development of a set of instruments uniquely designed for the community college. With that in mind, I currently have two doctoral dissertations under way to develop instruments which will hopefully help solve this problem. The first of these we have tentatively called "A Community College

Climate Inventory." This instrument would allow us to make a general assessment of the climate in a community college with separate analyses on some thirty or more different dimensions of climate. It is our hope that this instrument could be designed so that we would be able to get a rating on each of these dimensions by various groups which are in the college. The second tool is entitled "A Community College Communications Inventory," and is directed at providing us with a means of assessing the communications within a college. We selected communications as our first in-depth tool because most organizational development theorists agree that the beginning point in most organizational development interventions is with the communications within the organization.

The next problem that we are faced with is that of cost. I don't have to remind you of the problems you face with in selling a staff development program on your campuses because of cost. This is despite the fact that you are probably operating on a budget of less than one percent of the total salaries budget of your institution when to do a good job would require an investment more in the neighborhood of two to four percent. You know, I've never understood the reluctance of administrators to budget the same percentage for the maintenance of people that they so readily budget for maintenance of typewriters and other equiment. However, the cost of an organizational development effort is considerably greater than that of most staff development programs. In fact, you can compare the two by using the analogy that staff development is to organizational development as going to a dentist is to going to an orthodontist. In fact, if you think about it, the analogy is quite appropriate. Staff development is often focused on a particular problem and normally solvable in a relatively short period of time, whereas organizational development deals with more significant problem areas, many of which require considerable time to correct. I don't have to tell you about the difference in cost between the two.

The final problem that I would like to talk about is one that, in the final analysis will probably mean that significant strides in organizational development are still a number of years in the future. This has to do with the lack of sufficiently trained persons who would be able to function in an effective manner as an organizational development person. In thinking about this problem I tried to imagine what I would do if I were president of a college and felt the need for an organizational development thrust. As I mentally thought of the various individuals around the country that might be used, I came up with two individuals. I then went to my roladex and went through that. I had added two more names to the list. All four are somewhat expensive, and all are very busy people. Add to this the further complication that often arises in the "chemical reaction" between the intervention agent and college personnel and you are down to one or two people.

As you can see from this list, the problems that OD faces are significant. Further, the problems are not the type that are likely to be solved overnight. Consequently, I am not extremely positive about the immediate prospects for organizational development. However, I have not given up.

I would like to close on a positive note by offering some suggestions regarding ways in which you the staff development practitioner and we the university professors can together encourage and expedite the acceptance and implementation of organizational development.

The first of these is for both of us to begin to write articles which explain and call attention to the need for organizational development. Secondly, if those of us in a position to do so could begin offering training in organizational development to those individuals coming through our program that would help. In the meantime, you can include orientations to organizational development in the management training workshops on your own campuses. Those of us in the ivory towers could also help by encouraging students to do research

and by conducting our own research on ways of adapting OD techniques to the community college setting. And finally, we can work together to secure funds for the training of some staff development facilitators in the theory and practice of organizational development.

In conclusion, I hope you understand why I considered some of the titles I did as I was preparing for this presentation. I also trust you realize why I am of the opinion that staff development alone will fail and why I'm so convinced that "staff development is not enough." Thank you.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
DEC 5 1980